REMARKS

In the ***final*** Official Action mailed July 1, 2010 the Office noted that claims 1-22 were pending and rejected claims 1-22. In this response no claims have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-22 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT

Applicants submit here a supplemental response to augment the remarks of the amendment filed December 29, 2010, which Applicants request be entered. Applicants request that the current remarks be used.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Morgan, U.S. Patent No. 6,373,201. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

The Applicants have amended claim 21 to recite "means adapted to store ***data relating to*** one or more objects." (Emphasis added) Support for the amendment may be found, for example, page 11, lines 13-14 and 21. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of claim 21. Claim 1 has been likewise amended.

On page 3 of the Office Action it is asserted "[t]he Examiner has interpreted that the secure entity is interpreted as the lamp module with associated circuitry (FIG. 1), storing an object (lamp/bulb) that has a lifespan."

Thus, the Office interprets the object as a physical entity (i.e. lamp/bulb) and not data relating to one or more objects as in the amended claim 21.

Thus, claim 21 as amended clarifies that the claimed electronic entity stores data defining an object, not a physical object as in Morgan. There is no reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have applied the teachings of Morgan, relating to avoiding explosion of a lamp for consumer safety (see columns 1 & 2 in Morgan), to an object defined by data, for which such a risk does not exist indeed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1 and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Morgan.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Morgan in view of Paratore, U.S. Patent No. 6,294,997. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Paratore adds nothing to the deficiencies of Morgan as

applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Morgan and Paratore, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 11 and 12.

Claims 13, 16, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Morgan in view of Paratore in view of Hennig, U.S. Patent No. 5,514,995. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Hennig adds nothing to the deficiencies of Morgan and Paratore as applied against claims 11 and 12. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Morgan, Paratore and Hennig, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 13, 16, 17 and 20.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Morgan in view of Hennig. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Hennig adds nothing to the deficiencies of Morgan as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Morgan and Hennig, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 19.

Claims 1 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over De Beer, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0129078. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Claims 1 and 21 have been amended as discussed above.

Further, on page 6 of the Office Action it is acknowledged that De Beer is silent as "to temporarily unusable (updating and invalidating means)." However, "the Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that when the validity has expired, that the phone would not be used to phone calls as an expedient for security."

The Applicants cannot ascertain from the Office Action whether the Office takes Official Notice of the updating and invalidating means. If Official Notice is taken, Applicants submit that at the time of the invention, such a feature was ***not*** capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. Therefore, in any future Office Action where such a rejection is maintained the Applicants request that citation to a reference where such a feature is demonstrated be provided.

Further, the Office asserts "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that when the validity has expired, that the phone would not be used to phone calls as an expedient for security." However, the Office has acknowledged on page 6 of the Office Action that "De Beer is silent on updating and invalidating means." The Office has provided no justification for updating the lifespan of the object based on the teaching of De Beer.

For at least the reasons discussed above, De Beer fails to render obvious the teachings of claims 1 and 21.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims view of the foregoing claims 1-22 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jr